(32)

(Separate Revenue)

File no 82 of 97-98

89/—4

Undersd

M. K. Jain

Mysore Dewan's office — ROUTINE NOTES. ..... Department

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc.]

Submitted Ker

This paper (Viz Excise Comm's No: 8662/534 of 19th June 1898 regarding the appeal of Ramachar, late Excise Clerk of Kadur District Office, against the infliction on him by the Excise Commr of a fine of Rs 5/-) was ordered to lie over pending the settlement of the question, which was then before the Dewan, as to whether the appointments of Supervisors on Rs 40/- should be appointed by the Deputy Commr or by the Excise Commissioners. Vide Secretary's order dated 4th July 1898 inside the above letter (against para 7) which runs thus ~~to this effect~~:-

"This question is now before the Dewan I think. If so wait till it is settled".

Now that by para 4 of Govt: Hofs No: 6362-71/Sa.F.11-97 dated the 20th/11 Febry 1901, it has been settled that all Supervisors irrespective pay have to be appointed by the Excise Comm

J.R 82 of 1897-98

B

N.B.—Should notes, etc., be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or the slips passed on this form.

with delegated powers, the papers is re-
submitted for orders.

Under the Go 20/2/07
the Excise Comm^r
has full power to
appoint, suspend & ~~exercise~~
supervisors whose pay
does not exceed Rs 100
the pay of the appellant
who was merely acting as
supervisor & who reverts
to the Excise Hd clerk.
~~he is~~ appears to be
within Rs 100

Hy 16/3/01

Draw the attention
of the Accountant to
the Delay in this
order

17/3/07

N. B.—Should notes ~~not~~ be written on small slips the notes must be copied or the slips pasted on this form.

Submitted,

Ramachar's appeal was ordered to lie over till the settlement of the question as to ~~whether~~ whether supervisors on Rs 40/- are to be appointed by the respective Deputy Commrs or the Excise Commr. The question as regards the powers of the Deputy Commrs and the Excise Commr. to appoint subordinates of the Excise Dept., is pending before the Dewan with reference to the Kolar Deputy Commrs objection to the arrangements made by the Excise Commr. without consulting the former.

KG
28/3/00.

Matter V
Appeal
lie over
as Ordered
by Mr Hayes
M
29/3/00

1 4
5753
No. 82 of 98.
10 FEB. 1898
DEWAN'S OFFICE

Recd
10/2/98

18/2/98.

Submitted for orders

16/2/98

Recd 16-2-98

18/2/98

To the Sec: Govt. for what

21/2/98

21-2-98

Drafted
22/2/98.

SECTION S. A
FILE No. 82 of 97
SERIAL No. 1

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kaduna District

To The Secretary to Government
Genl. & Rev. Departments

Dated 5th
Despatched 8th February
Received
General No. 534/1897-98.
No.

Enclosure No. 2

Has the honor to forward herewith for orders of Government an appeal Petition of Ramachan, Excise Head Clerk, appealing against the order of the Excise Commissioner fining him Rs 5. for neglect of duty, and to enclose herein Report No. 361 dated 3d. instant from the General Assistant Commissioner in charge of the Excise Department.

2. The undersigned concurs generally in the view of the case taken by the General

Assistant Commissioner, and submits that it would, in the opinion of the undersigned, have been more in accordance with the Rules of the Public Service which give the Deputy Commissioner general control over all District Subordinates, if the appellant's case had been left to be dealt with by the Deputy Commissioner after taking from the Supervisor such explanation as appeared called for.

Dy Commissioner

Kadner Dt.

Enclosure to 84

To

The Secretary to Government of Mysore,
Revenue and General departments,
Bangalore.

Through the Deputy Commissioner,
Kadur District

Dated 18th January 1898

Most honored Sir,

That with the sentiments of deepest respect and humble submission the Appellant craves permission to submit for your honors kind and favourable consideration his humble appeal against the orders of the Excise Commissioner persuant to the reports of the Special Assistant to Excise Commissioner, Mysore Division direct to the Excise Commissioner in his Letter Nos 538 and 576 dated 16th/18 and 24th Ultimo respectively.

2. The letter 538 states that there are several instances of neglect of duty on the part of the Appellant though in fact there is none and mention is made, as one of the said instances that the Appellant failed to prosecute the man whom the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner ordered to do. The man referred is one by name Imam Khan Sahib

Imam Khan Sahib, Toddy Vend Farmer, Singadakalli circle. It is true that the Appellant did not prosecute the person, because at the time there were not sufficient grounds to institute criminal proceedings against him inasmuch as the said Imam Khan Sahib had himself complained against the Inspector (Thiruvasamy Pillay) of having substituted his application for 1400 date trees by a forged one for 588 trees. This complaint was being enquired into by the Appellant himself at the time; so, if proceedings had been instituted no case could have been made out against the person. Under these circumstances the Appellant thought it best to refer the matter to the Deputy Commissioner and has actually done so. Pending orders from the Deputy Commissioner the Appellant could not take any step in a criminal Court against the said Imam Khan Sahib. The Appellant respectfully prays your honour to consider whether this would be a neglect of duty as alleged by the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner.

3. The Special Assistant Excise Commissioner's letter No 576 begins with saying that there are fightings and quarrels between the Inspector and the Appellant. It is clear that the Inspector is a subordinate of the Appellant and as such the Inspector is

is bound to obey the orders of the [redacted]
Whenever the orders of the Appellant [redacted] not obeyed by the Inspector remarks [redacted] been made against him on his diaries and the Inspector in his turn has tried to throw the blame upon the Appellant. If this, as the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner calls, amounts to fighting, the Appellant prays your honor to consider how Supervisors can keep respect and take work from their subordinates.

4. The said letter also states that trees have been tapped but they are not marked. this, he says, is owing to so called fightings between the Inspector found the Appellant. The Appellant has not lacked in his duty of issuing licenses no sooner there were proper applications therefor, and all that, if the trees remain unmarked the Appellant is unable to understand how he is responsible for the unmarking of the trees.

5 The Special Assistant Excise Commissioner further reports that hundreds of trees have been tapped unmarked and that is owing to want of inspection and report. Had it not been for the inspections of the grove by the Appellant this circumstance could not have been brought to light and the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner would

would have been as ignorant thereof as before. That the person that is immediately in charge of the grove is the Inspector, and that it is he who can make a report as to the same immediately, are well known to the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner, in spite of that the Appellant is blamed therefor. In the same letter the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner says "The question of who is responsible for allowing the trees to be tapped before being marked has nothing to do with marking of the trees, now that they have been tapped". In so saying he has failed to see that if such indulgence is shown, there will be no end of illicit tappings and there will be no chances of bringing culprits to trial and the loss of revenue will be immense. The Appellant thought it best under these circumstances to report the matter to the Deputy Commissioner and has done so, and has consequently not got the trees illicitly tapped marked. Finally the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner says "My own experience of the man's work (Appellant's) is that which I have already expressed viz. - that he is altogether unfitted for his post, he is not to be trusted, he can not be believed, he

shirks

thinks his work in a most disgraceful manner, and should never be retained as supervisor anywhere." This experience I beg to submit was only of 4 or 5 days i.e from the 8th to 13th November 1897.

6 In this connection it will not be out of place for the Appellant to mention that the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner on his way to Bangalore on the 10th November 1897 (evening) ordered the Appellant to wait for him at the Kadur Railway station on the morning of the 12th November 1897 to attend to some of his private duties. The Appellant would have done so had it not been for urgent government duty — This being the investigation of the complaint referred to in para 2) which compelled him to be absent from Kadur on the 11th November 97 Very early the next morning (i.e on the 12th) the Appellant saw the Special Asst Excise Commissioner which is obvious from his diary. When he asked the Appellant why he was not present at the station the Appellant explained to him what had happened the previous day (11th November 97) and brought to his notice the irregularities committed by

the Inspector (Thumburusamy Pillay). But the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner gave the Appellant a mean ill treatment which he did not deserve. The Appellant as a subordinate bore them up with patience. He further threatened the Appellant with dismissall when the Appellant answered him in a manner not at all amounting to improper manner that he was a subordinate and the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner could do whatever he pleased. He even ordered the Appellant to leave the Compound of the Traveller's Bungalow which he did. The very afternoon he sent a chit (which the Appellant has carefully preserved along with other vouchers) asking the Appellant to be present with the Inspector in the Thangli Toddy Grove. Accordingly the Toddy Inspector and the Appellant were present in the Grove. On his arrival the Appellant pointed out the irregularities which had been noted in his (Appellant's) diary of the 11th November 97. The Appellant takes this opportunity to represent that the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner fortunately for the Inspector took no notice of the forged application (mentioned in para 2) but reprimanded the Appellant himself though no fault was found with him at the time of inspection in the grove.

7 The Appellant begs to submit herewith a summary of his life in the Excise Department for your honour's kind and considerate perusal. That summary

he

he begs leave to state, has been [redacted]
prepared so as to set forth facts:-

A. He was appointed as a writer Bund in your honor's office in the year 1885 and was transferred to the Excise department in the year 1889 when the Arrack new scheme came into force. During his tenure of the appointment of the 4th grade Inspector (Tester) on Rs 15+10 he gave satisfaction to the departmental authorities by detecting many a case of opium smuggling in the Mysore district and brought a number of cases at the risk of his life before the Courts, all of which ended in the convic- of the smugglers. The remarks made by several Magistrates who had the opportunity of having these opium cases bear good testimony to the above mentioned facts in his favour. The opinion of the Munsiff Magistrate of Kanjangud noted in the margin also bears good testimony to his detective capability.

(B) In recognition of these services he was promoted to the 2nd grade Inspector's post of Rs 25+10. It will not be out of place for the Appellant to mention that he was recommended to a supervisor's post not only [redacted]

X "The Tester has done well in taking prompt action in the matter. The opium detected is worth only Rs 3-9-0 & I would have awarded him a substantial reward. He deserves credit."

by the deputy Commissioner but also by Messrs B. J. Kumarasami Naik and B. Ramasamy Iyengar, General and Extra Assistant Commissioners, respectively Esserting himself during the short-period of three months, as acting supervisor of the Kadur Range, the Appellant has detected 2 cases* in the Tarikere Taluk. one of which ended in the conviction of the Arrack Bonded depot Mutsaddy and the other is pending orders for prosecution.

1 Shortage ... ing in ... bbl.
2 Illicit ... of Arrack ... the depot.

8. In these circumstances the appellant is at a loss to understand by what standard the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner has measured his qualifications and has passed such remarks as are referred to in para 5 setting at nought the records left by 4 or 5 Officers of highest responsibility and respect under whom the Appellant served, which speak to his ability integrity, character, zeal and fidelity. Weighed in the balance the observations made by the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner in one scale and the favourable remarks and approved ability recommended by the above mentioned officers in the other, it is left to your honour to decide which is heavier

9. In Conclusion the Appellant most humbly and respectfully [redacted]

1stly. That the order of fine may be cancelled.

2ndly That he may be restored to his acting appointment in order that he may be confirmed.

10. For this act of justice and generosity the Appellant will as in duty bound, ever pray.

He begs to remain
most honored sir
Your most obedient and humble servt.

Ramachan
Excise Head Clerk
Deputy Commissioners office
Kadur District.

Draft as per orders 13

To

The Excise Commr
in Mysore.

SECTION S.R
FILE NO. 82797
SERIAL NO. 2

No 7915-/298 Ex: 3
Dated 24th February/98.
24.

In forwarding herewith copy of docket no 534 dated the 5th instant together with its enclosures in original, received from the D.C. Kadur Distt, forwarding an appeal petition from Ramachar, Excise Head Clerk, appealing against the order of the Excise Commr fining him Rs 5/-, I have the honor to request the Excise Commr ~~is requested to~~ will be so good as to submit ~~an early~~ report in the matter.

"K.O."
22/2/98
Secretary

BB
22/2/98

Sm 581 13 4

Gen. 30]

18 98

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
No. 9573
JN. 27 1898
No .....
DEWAN'S OFFICE

From

The Excise Commissioner in Mysore,

SECTION S. R.

FILE No. 82 of 97-98

SERIAL No. 3

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General & Revenue *Deptt*

Dated 19th
Despatched 25 } June 1898
Received

General No. 8667
No 534
Enclosure No. 3

In reply to Secretary's docket
No 7916, dated 24th February 1898
Ex 298 SUBJECT.
Submits with opinion copy of the memo received from the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner, Mysore Division, regarding the petition from Ramachar appealing against the fine of Rs 5, inflicted on him when he was acting as Supervisor, Kadur Rng.

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Secretary
Submitted for orders.

27/6/98

27/6/98

27-6-98

Above letter
27-6-98

Excise Commissioner's Office

No. 8667/534 Bangalore, dated 19th June/25 1898

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General & Revenue departments

Sir,

In reply to your docket No. 7915/Ex298, dated 24th February 1898, I have the honor to state that I inflicted a fine of Rs 5 on petitioner Ramachar when he was acting Supervisor of the Kadur Range, for disobedience of orders and neglect of duty reported by Mr. Kearns, Special Assistant Excise Commissioner, Mysore Division, as per particulars below:—

(1) Delay in the submission of his diaries, as well as those of his Inspectors. The Special Assistant Excise Commissioner gave him distinct orders that he should despatch his weekly diaries immediately after the close of the week to which they relate, and his Inspectors' diaries as received

received by him. Nevertheless, he despatched only on the 8th December 1897, his diary for the week ended 4th December 1897, and on the 14th December 1897, he posted his diary for the week ended 11th idem. His diaries for the weeks ended 6th November 1897 and 13th November 1897, were both despatched by him on the 17th November 1897, as per his own entries in the diaries. He despatched along with his diary for the week ended 4th December 1897, the Inspectors' diaries covering periods from week ending 13th November 1897, instead of submitting them as received by him.

(2) Disobedience of orders in not prosecuting, as ordered by the Divisional officer, certain persons who illicitly tapped date trees.

2. Copy of the Divisional officer's memo, dated 26th ultimo offering his remarks on the appeal petition of Ramachar, is herewith submitted.

3. On the matter being reported to me by the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner, I disposed of it, as the appointments of all grades of Supervisors used to be made by the Excise

Excise Commissioner, and more particularly as the fault of the acting Supervisor was conclusively clear from his own diaries which were sent to me for reference by the Special Assistant Excise Commissioner.

4. The original enclosures of the docket under reply, are herewith returned.

5. I may add that the Deputy Commissioner should have made the reference through this Office.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

Encl. to S.L. 3 178

Memorandum on Ramachari's appeal

Para 2. My charge against the Superior was for disobedience of my orders in not lodging a prosecution against certain men. The appellant admits the fact and proceeds to argue that he did not carry out the order for various reasons and opinions. Herein lay his fault. The appellant, as a subordinate, was bound to carry out the order of his Superior officer. Whether that order was right, or wrong, I was responsible, and his duty, (was) to carry it out. The reasons and objections raised by him, were all known to me, and it was after due consideration of all he had to say that I ordered the prosecution. Moreover, I had other very special reasons for desiring a prosecution, feeling sure it would bring to light many irregularities that were going on; and this I plainly told the appellant at the time. He too was well aware of what the result would be if he carried out the order, and hence

hence his disobedience, by which he successfully frustrated what I wanted. It has also to be borne in mind that he deliberately omitted to carry out the order, and never reported the fact or explained his conduct.

Para 3. That the appellant and his Inspector were quarrelling and fighting with one another in a way detrimental to the progress of the work is an undoubted fact capable of proof by their diaries and returns. But I never expressed any opinion as to who was in the right, and who was in the wrong. There was a private quarrel of very long standing; but I never went into the merits or demerits of the complaints of the two. All I did was to express the opinion that for the good of the Public Service it was highly desirable that both men should be transferred to different Ranges.

Para 4. That trees were being tapped & unmarked is an undoubted fact. I myself saw some 600 of them, and it was in respect to these trees that I ordered the prosecution —

referred

referred to under para 2 above. Who was to blame for the said trees not being marked, was the very point which would have come to light had the prosecution been lodged then. I may mention that the case has since been prosecuted. The appellant pleads, that having issued the Licenses and orders to mark the trees he is unable to understand how he is responsible for the non-marking of the trees" No one says he is responsible for the non-marking of the trees, but he is distinctly responsible for not having prosecuted the tappers when he found them tapping before the trees were marked. This was his fault, and that the appellant does not recognize it, only exposes his ignorance of his duties. It may not be out of place to mention here that within a month of his having been removed from the Range 550 trees were discovered being illicitly tapped.

Para 5.

Para 5. Here the Supervisor proceeds to criticise my order for a prosecution, and after doing so says he thought it best. "Under these circumstances to report the matter to the Deputy Commissioner." Surely such procedure is subversive of all discipline; and does not the appellant convict himself of a studied attempt to ignore all orders issued by me. I was responsible for the order, and for the outcome of it, and all the appellant had to do was to obey the order. If each subordinate is permitted to sit in judgment on every order received by him, and then act as he thinks fit, there will be an end to all discipline and control.

Para 5-ve 6. As regards these paras I can only maintain the opinion I expressed. I do not consider appellant either straight-forward or truthful. I had many reasons for coming to this conclusion.

As regards his incapacity for his

his post, I have to say that the state of affairs in his Range clearly showed it. But if more is wanting, I may mention the following few specimens of how appellant did his work:—

(i) Within a month of his leaving the Range 550 trees were found in various groves being illicitly tapped, and the tapping had been going on long before he left the Range. I believe appellant never reported a case of this nature.

(ii) Out of 98 days the appellant was in charge of the Range, he spent 42 days in Kadur itself excluding holidays and days he was then in attendance on me. Considering the Range he had to work, and the known neglect of duty of Inspector Thumbuswami Pillay, does this sort of patrolling show the appellant to be an active and energetic officer with a due sense of his responsibilities? I spoke to the appellant about the way he was hanging about Kadur in November - but there was no improvement whatever subsequently.

(iii)

(iii) An offence of not keeping a sufficient stock of ammunition and writing false accounts &c &c was reported by an Inspector to the appellant sometime in October 1897; he handed over charge of the Range on the 7th January 1898, and on the 19th January he sends the charge sheet in the above case to his successor with the remark that he had forgotten to lodge the Complaint. Does this look like an officer who was attending to his duties?

(iv) Finally, although when I inspected the Range in November 1897, I gave the appellant very careful and detailed instructions in maintaining his Registers &c, in January when I again inspected them I found that not only had he neglected to carry out every order he possibly could neglect but his weekly Progress Report (T.F.2) of marking had never been submitted, this too spite of the

the fact that I had made sample entries in a form for his guidance In my diary for week ending 15th January 1898 I have set out in full the extent to which the appellant had grossly neglected his duty. No man after all the instructions he had received could possibly have committed so many mistakes — in fact if he had tried to commit mistakes he could not have committed more — for he had not even tried to carry out any order or instruction. I consider that the state of his records after the instructions he had received (and even sample entries made in every form) conclusively proves, if nothing else does, that the appellant was unfit for his post.

Camp Sagar
26th March

(Sd) A. S. Kearns
Special Assistant Excise Commissioner, Mysore Division

"Copy" M Devaraj

Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

Enclosure 5 & 3

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
Kadur District.

To,

The Secretary to Government,
Genl. and Rev. Departments.

Dated 5th February 1898.

General No. 534.

Has the honor to forward herewith for orders of Government an appeal Petition of Ramachar, Excise Head Clerk, appealing against the order of the Excise Commissioner fining him Rs 5/- for neglect of duty, and to enclose herein Report No. 361 dated 3rd instant from the General Assistant Commissioner in charge of the Excise Department.

2. The undersigned concurs generally in the view of the case taken by the General

Assistant Commissioner, and submits that it would, in the opinion of the undersigned, have been more in accordance with the Rules of the Public Service which give the Deputy Commissioner general control over all District subordinates, if the appellant's case had been left to be dealt with by the Deputy Commissioner after taking from the Supervisor such explanation as appeared called for.

1807 J. Weir.
Deputy Commissioner,
Kadur District.

"Copy"

Narasimha
for Secretary
Compd.
Kms

Enclos 6563

26

Regd No 963

(General Serial No. 30.)

4-2-1898.

From The General Assistant Commr. in charge, Excise

To Deptt, Kadur District

The Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District

398
KADUR DISTRICT

Dated 3rd February 1898

Despatched

Received 4.2.98

Enclosures No. 3 files

General No. 361 } 1897-98
No.

Sir.

In resubmitting with records connected therewith the appeal petition of Ramaichar, Excise Head Clerk of this office received with your Docket no: 4061 dated 20/21st January 1898, I have the honor to state that the Supervisor's statement, that he reported certain matters to the Deputy Commissioner appear to be well-founded. The reports referred to by the Supervisor are his report no: 620 dated 13th November 1897 and 647 dated

17

Dated 26th November 1897 on both of which orders have been passed by my predecessor Mr. Kumara Sami Naik for the Deputy Commissioner Excise Department.

I have also submitted a memo on the subject of Ramachar's appeal.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

T. Ramanujam
General Assistant Commr.
in charge of Excise Deptt.
Kadur District

Enclosure No 3

Memo.

Ramachari appeal is now against the fine imposed on him by his order of the 12th inst. Head Clerk Rs 2.

He was fined five Rupees by the Executive Court in consequence of a report made against him by Mr Cairns in his letter No 538 of 16/12/97.

The charges made against Ramachari by Mr Cairns in the above letter are as follows.

1. That he was not performing his duties in due time with sufficient carefulness.

2. That his diaries showed that he did very poor work during the week ended 4th Dec 1897

3. That he went to Chickmagalur to consult Mr Ramachari with regard to some time when in Mr Cairns opinion there was no necessity for such consultation

4. That the Superviser over the shops were constantly fighting

5. That his Superviser was not carrying out Mr Carnes orders as was shewn by his failure to prosecute Ramkhan Sahib for keeping their liquor without license.

2. I cannot say anything about the 1st & 2nd of the above charges as the facts on ~~the~~ which they are based are in the Excise Commrs office having been submitted to the Excise Comr by Mr Carnes with his letter. With regard to the 3rd charge, I beg leave to state that Mr Carnes is not justified in saying that his Superviser could have done nothing to prevent Mr Ramaswami mudali about Mr Ramaswami mudali was looking after the Excise work of the whole District. ~~It was to us~~ his Superviser stands

have looked up to him for instructions on all matters and not to Mr Cameron whose visits to his District were at intervals as he did more than one District under his charge. If Mr Kumaravami Naik has thought that Ramachar was wrong in coming to Chickmagalur to consult him, he would have taken notice of his malice. When he has answered to me his not disapproval of Ramachar's action in coming to Chickmagalur to consult him, it is not for Mr Cameron to take objection to such conduct by the Superintendent.

3. So far as I can judge from his records, Ramachar does not seem to be solely responsible for his Guard being [redacted] Inspector; [redacted]

he then left some things in our accountant clerks who was responsible for his general — he or his ~~sub~~ deputy

4 With regard to his delay in distributing the Receipts against Mr Kaye, I can hear no Remarks stated that he made a report to his Sup[r] Com[r] about an application of Mr Kaye's agents to his Judges.

5. In Consequence of a subsequent report made by Mr Cairns, Remarks was ordered to resign his place as Chief Head clerk. Mr Cairns was of opinion (and I agree with him) that for his ~~general~~ conduct & foul work, it was desirable that

with his Superiors or his Chief
but should be sent out of Cadar
range. + The Ramanaar was accordingly
deprived of his range ~~The~~ and
~~Superiors~~ order'd to rest in his
place in his Dr Office. This reverses
it should a sufficient punishment
for his man for any irregularities he
might have committed ~~by~~ and
his time employ on him. may,
in my humble opinion, be Excused.

I Remain my Lord
General Exa Comr
in Chief &c Excuse depr

3/2/98

190

From

THE SECY. TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
GEN. & REV. DEPTS.

To

The Deputy Commr
Kadur District.
(Through the Excise Commr)

SECTION S.R
FILE No. 82 of 97-98
SERIAL No. 4

Dated
Despatched
Received
General No. 7634 & 23/3/01 -
No. Ex 371 23

Enclosure No.

His docket No: 534/1897-98 dated the 5th February 1898 forwarding for the orders of Government a petition of Ramachar, Excise Head Clerk, appealing against the order of the Excise Commr fining him Rs 5/- for neglect of duty.

With reference to the above, has the honour to invite the Deputy Commr's attention to para 4 of Govt. Procs No: 6362-71/Ex.7.11-97 & 20th Feby 1901 in

in which it has been settled that the Excise Commissioners will have full powers in respect of all Superiors drawing upto Rs 100/-

By Order

for Secretary

22/3/01

Copy & Excise Comr letter to letter no 8617/534 dt 19/6/98

7635/Rm372 dt 23/3/01

23

BO

23/3/01